



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/394,345 09/13/99 TAKAYAMA I 0756-2028

022204
NIXON PEABODY, LLP
8180 GREENSBORO DRIVE
SUITE 800
MCLEAN VA 22102

LMC1/0830

EXAMINER

OSORIO, R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2778

DATE MAILED:

08/30/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/394,345

Applicant(s)

Takayama et al.

Examiner

Ricardo Osorio

Group Art Unit

2778



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jul 24, 2000

☒ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 11-27 is/are pending in the application

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 11-27 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit: 2778

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. Examiner acknowledges that amendment of claim 11 overcomes the 112 second paragraph rejection and objection, which is now being dropped.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. **Claims 11 and 13-19, and 21-26** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lou et al. (4,042,854) in view of applicant's admitted prior art.

Under claims 11, 14, 17, 21 and 24, Lou teaches of an active matrix luminescent display device comprising a substrate (see col. 1, line 68), a plurality of light emissive elements arranged in a matrix over said substrate, first TFTs (T1, Fig 3) over said substrate, second TFTs (T2, Fig. 3) over said substrate and connected to the light emissive elements (EL, Fig. 3), respectively, wherein one of said first TFTs is connected to the gate of one of said second TFTs, a first signal line (20, Fig. 1) and a second signal line intersecting each other (16, Fig. 3), the first signal line (20) is connected to a gate of the first TFT (T1, Fig. 3) and the second signal line (16) is connected to the source or drain of the first TFT (T1), in the second TFT the other one of the source or drain of the first TFT is connected to a gate of the second TFT (see Fig. 3), an electroluminescent element (EL) electrically connected to the source or drain of the second TFT (see Fig. 3), a power supply line electrically connected to the other one of the source or drain of the second TFT (see Fig. 3), and a capacitor (CS, in Fig. 3) formed between the gate of the

Art Unit: 2778

second TFT and the source or drain of the second TFT to which said power supply line (18) is connected (see Fig. 3).

Under claims 11, 13, 14, 17, 21 and 24, Lou teaches of an electroluminescent display device, but fails to teach of that said device is an organic electroluminescent device.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use any kind of luminescent display device including organic electroluminescent or non-organic electroluminescent, in the device of Lou, because applicant's admitted prior art states that an active matrix type flat-panel display device with light emissive elements and respective drive TFTs which are two dimensionally arranged along X-axis and Y-axis in matrix is known (see spec. page 1, lines 11-14).

Under claims 15, 16, 18, 19, 22, 23, 25 and 26, Luo teaches a video signal applied to the gate of the second TFT through said second signal line (16) and said first TFT (T1) and said power supply line extends parallel with said second signal line (see Figs. 3 and 4 and col. 2, lines 17-30).

3. **Claims 12, 20 and 27** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Luo et al. in view of applicant's admitted prior art, as applied to claims 11 and 13-19 above, and further in view of Fischer (3,885,196).

Under claims 12, 20 and 27, the device of Luo, as anticipated by applicant's admitted prior art, fails to teach of an electroluminescent display device comprising a first shift register and a second shift register electrically connected to first thin film transistors.

Art Unit: 2778

Under claims 12, 20 and 27, Fisher teaches of a first SR and a second SR electrically connected to a plurality of first TFTs (see Figs. 1-2, col. 1, lines 27-31 and 42-44, and col .3, lines 29-45). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the shift registers, as taught by Fisher, in the combined device of Luo and applicant's admitted prior art because shift registers are commonly known to be used in the art of electroluminescent display devices to convert parallel data to serial data.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed July 24, 2000 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In the remarks, applicant admits that the use of first and second TFTs for driving an EL element is conventional within the art, also, applicant admits that the use of organic EL is a known and conventional concept within the art.

Applicant argues that Luo in view of admitted prior art by applicant fails to be an express or implied teaching or disclosure of an active matrix organic EL display device having two TFTs in one pixel.

Examiner disagrees because, as mentioned in office action, applicant's admitted prior art states that an active matrix type flat-panel display device with light emissive elements and respective drive TFTs which are two dimensionally arranged along X-axis and Y-axis in matrix is known (see spec. page 1, lines 11-14).

Art Unit: 2778

Also, applicant argues that there is a lack of suggestion as to why a skilled artisan would use the proposed modification to achieve the unobvious advantage recognized by the applicants.

Examiner disagrees because, the fact that applicant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985).

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2778

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ricardo Osorio whose telephone number is (703) 305-2248. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800.

5. **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or: (703) 308-6606 (for informal or draft communications, please label

"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Ricardo Osorio

August 17, 2000



BIPIN SHALWALA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2700